



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

HC
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,017	10/18/2000	Haruo Kamei	550718.077	4521

27805 7590 09/12/2002

THOMPSON HINE L.L.P.
2000 COURTHOUSE PLAZA, N.E.
10 WEST SECOND STREET
DAYTON, OH 45402

EXAMINER

BERRY, WILLIE WENDELL JR

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3723

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A1

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/691,017	KAMEI, HARUO
	Examiner Willie Berry, Jr.	Art Unit 3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 7,9,11,13,14 and 16-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 7,9,11,13,14 and 16-26 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 7, 9, 20, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by European Patent no. 798081 to Nokubi et al.

Nokubi discloses an abrasive material comprising: a core (1), a polishing layer (column 2, lines 31-39; the synthetic glue is inherently “flexible” as the pliant shot deforms during use) having a flexible layer, and abrasive particles (2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3723

4. Claims 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 16-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Close.

Close discloses an abrasive material comprising a core (12), a polishing layer (18) having abrasive particles (column 5, lines 46-50), and an adhesive (16).

Close does not disclose the abrasive material in the form of granules, the core made from form resin, the specific size of the core and specific composition of the adhesive.

The abrasive material in the form of granules and core made from form resin would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, since Close state in column 5, lines 8-15; that the abrasive material can have any shape and Close states in column 5, lines 25-33; that the core can be made from varies materials. Therefore it would have been obvious to have made the changes to the abrasive material and core in regards to the teachings of Close.

In regards to claims 19-21, the specific size of the core and specific composition of the adhesive would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, since it is within the general skill of a worker in the art to discover a workable range of the core and selecting a known composition for the adhesive on the basis of their suitability involves only routine skill in the art.

Art Unit: 3723

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 16-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Willie Berry whose telephone number is (703) 308-7467.

WB
Willie Berry, Jr. :wbj
Examiner
Art Unit 3723
September 5, 2002

Joseph J. Hail, III
Joseph J. Hail, III
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 3700